

REMARKS

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated April 20, 2006. In view of this amendment, this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue.

No new matter is introduced by this amendment. Claims 21, 22, 26, and 27 are amended to maintain proper dependency on new claim 29. Support for the amendment to new claim 29 is found in originally filed claims 19 and 20. Originally filed claim 19 provides support for new claim 30. New claim 31 is supported by claim 21, as originally filed. Originally filed claims 5 and 19 provide support for new claim 32. Support for new claim 33 is found in originally filed claim 1.

Claims 1-3, 6-14, 21-24, 26, 27, and 29-33 are pending in this application. Claims 19-22, 26, and 27 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement. Claims 15-18 are rejected. Claims 1-3, 6-14, and 23-24 are allowed. Claims 21, 22, 26, and 27 have been amended in this response. Claims 5, 25, and 28 were previously canceled. Claims 15-20 were canceled in this response. New claims 29-33 have been added in this response.

Notice of References Cited

It is noted that the Examiner did not cite Hokkyo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,387,483) on a PTO-892 Notice of References Cited form, although it was cited in a rejection of claims 15-18. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite Hokkyo et al. in a PTO-892 form and provide a copy of the PTO-892 form in the next official action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 6-14, 23, and 24 are allowed.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter.

New claim 33 depends from claim 6 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 6.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Carey et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,835,475) in view of Hokkyo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,387,483). This rejection is traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal thereof respectfully requested.

Claims 15-18 have been canceled, therefore, this rejection is moot.

Restriction

Applicants respectfully request rejoinder and allowance of withdrawn claims 21, 22, 26, and 27 in accordance with MPEP § 821.04. Applicants further request examination and allowance of new method claims 29-32.

In accordance with the Examiner's recommendation of amending the method claims to contain all the limitations of an allowed claim in order to be rejoined, new claim 29 includes all the limitations of allowed claim 6. Therefore claim 29, and the claims depending therefrom: claims 21, 22, 26, 27, 30, and 31, should be allowed. In addition, new method claim 32, which includes all the limitations of allowed claim 1, should be allowed.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 10/663,670

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Bernard P. Codd

Registration No. 46,429

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 BPC:MWE
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: July 20, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 49745
as our correspondence address.**